1	XAVIER BECERRA		
2	Attorney General of California JANE ZACK SIMON		
3	Z. T. T. T. Z. Z. T. Z. Z. T. Z.		
4	Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 111898		
5	455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000		
6	Telephone: (415) 703-5539		
7	Attorneys for Complainant		
8	BEFORE TH		
	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS		
9		ORNIA	
10	i iii tiit iiitatta oi tiit i itaataan ii igamba,	No. 800-2015-014341	
11	GEORGE WILLIAM PARKINSON, M.D 1426 East Hamilton Ave.	Cuse 110, 000 2013 0113 11	
12	Campbell, CA 95008	AULT DECISION	
13 .		ORDER	
. 14	Respondent. [Gov.	Code, §11520]	
15			
16			
17	<u>JURISDICTION</u>		
18	1. On or about October 4, 2017, Complainant Kimberly Kirchmeyer, in her official		
19	capacity as the Executive Director of the Medical Board	l of California, filed Accusation No. 800-	
20	2015-014341 against George William Parkinson, M.D (Respondent) before the Medical Board of	
21	California.		
22	2. On or about June 23, 1972, the Medical Box	ard of California (Board) issued	
23	Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. G 22439 to Respondent. The Physician's and Surgeon's		
24	Certificate expired on July 31, 2017, and has not been renewed.		
25	3. On or about October 4, 2017, Robyn Fitzwa	ater, an analyst in the Board's Discipline	
26	Coordination Unit, served by Certified Mail a copy of the Accusation No. 800-2015-014341,		
27	Statement to Respondent, Notice of Defense, Request for Discovery, and Government Code		
28	sections 11507.5, 11507.6, and 11507.7 to Respondent's address of record with the Board, which		
	1		

was and is: 1426 East Hamilton Ave., Campbell, CA 95008. A copy of the Accusation, the related documents, and Declaration of Service are included in the Exhibit Package¹ as Exhibit A, and are incorporated herein by reference. On October 6, 2017, Ms. Fitzwater served a courtesy copy of the Accusation to Respondent's home address.²

- 4. Service of the Accusation was effective as a matter of law under the provisions of Government Code section 11505, subdivision (c).
- 5. Records of the United States Postal Service (USPS) show that the Accusation was received at Respondent's home address on October 10, 2017. A copy of the receipt returned by the post office is included in the Exhibit Package as Exhibit B, and is incorporated herein by reference.
- 6. On October 19, 2017, counsel for Respondent confirmed that the Accusation had been received. Counsel advised that Respondent had not yet decided how to proceed, either by Notice of Defense or default. (See Declaration of Counsel, Exhibit Package, Exhibit C)
- 7. The time within which Respondent was required to file a Notice of Defense expired. On October 24, 2017, a Courtesy Notice of Default was sent to Respondent's address of record and to his home address. A courtesy copy was also sent to his attorney. USPS records show that the Courtesy Notice of Default was delivered to Respondent's attorney on October 26, 2017. A copy of the Courtesy Notice of Default and the USPS tracking record are included in the Exhibit Package as Exhibit D.
- 8. Respondent failed to file a Notice of Defense within 15 days after service upon him of the Accusation, and therefore waived his right to a hearing on the merits of Accusation No. 800-2015-014341.

. . //

The licensee's home address is omitted to protect privacy.

¹ The evidence in support of this Default Decision and Order is submitted herewith as "Exhibit Package."

25.26.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY

- 9. Statutory authority for this Default Decision is based upon the following sections of the Business and Professions Code and the Government Code.
 - 10. Business and Professions Code section 118 states, in pertinent part:
- "(b) The suspension, expiration, or forfeiture by operation of law of a license issued by a board in the department, or its suspension, forfeiture, or cancellation by order of the board or by order of a court of law, or its surrender without the written consent of the board, shall not, during any period in which it may be renewed, restored, reissued, or reinstated, deprive the board of its authority to institute or continue a disciplinary proceeding against the licensee upon any ground provided by law or to enter an order suspending or revoking the license or otherwise taking disciplinary action against the license on any such ground."
 - 11. Government Code section 11506 states, in pertinent part:
- "(c) The respondent shall be entitled to a hearing on the merits if the respondent files a notice of defense, and the notice shall be deemed a specific denial of all parts of the accusation not expressly admitted. Failure to file a notice of defense shall constitute a waiver of respondent's right to a hearing, but the agency in its discretion may nevertheless grant a hearing."
 - 12. California Government Code section 11520 states, in pertinent part:
- "(a) If the respondent either fails to file a notice of defense or to appear at the hearing, the agency may take action based upon the respondent's express admissions or upon other evidence and affidavits may be used as evidence without any notice to respondent."

FINDINGS OF FACT

13. The Board initiated an investigation of Respondent's patient care after receiving a complaint from a pharmacist that Respondent was prescribing large quantities of controlled substances to various individuals. Medical records and prescribing records were obtained and were reviewed by a medical expert consultant. Based upon his review, the consultant opined that Respondent's patient care and prescribing practices demonstrated multiple extreme departures from the standard of care. The expert reported to the Board that:

"Based on my evaluation of the records for several patients, I concluded

28

that Respondent's care, specifically his inappropriate prescribing of large quantities of opioids and other controlled substances, posed a danger to his patients and to the public."

(Declaration of Timothy A. Munzing, M.D., included in the Exhibit Package as Exhibit E)

Pursuant to its authority under Government Code section 11520, the Board finds Respondent is in default. The Board will take action without further hearing and, based on Respondent's express admissions by way of default and the evidence before it, contained in exhibits A through E, finds that the allegations in Accusation No. 800-2015-014341 are true.

DETERMINATION OF ISSUES

- Based on the foregoing findings of fact, Respondent George William Parkinson, M.D. has subjected his Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. G 22439 to discipline.
- 2. A copy of the Accusation and the related documents and Declaration of Service are included in the Exhibit Package.
 - The agency has jurisdiction to adjudicate this case by default. 3.
- 4. The Board is authorized to revoke Respondent's Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate based upon the following violations alleged in the Accusation: Gross negligence, excessive prescribing and repeated negligent acts in violation of Sections 2234, 2234(b), 2234(c) and 725 of the Business and Professions Code.

ORDER

IT IS SO ORDERED that Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. G 22439, heretofore issued to Respondent George William Parkinson, M.D., is revoked.

Pursuant to Government Code section 11520, subdivision (c), Respondent may serve a written motion requesting that the Decision be vacated and stating the grounds relied on within seven (7) days after service of the Decision on Respondent. The agency in its discretion may vacate the Decision and grant a hearing on a showing of good cause, as defined in the statute.

This Decision shall become effective on <u>December 22, 2017</u>	
--	--

It is so ORDERED November 22, 2017

hmever. Zxecutive Director

FOR THE MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA

		FILED STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
1	XAVIER BECERRA Attorney General of California	MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA SACRAMENTO October 4 2017		
2	JANE ZACK SIMON Supervising Deputy Attorney General	BY Robyn Francer ANALYST		
3	Lawrence Mercer Deputy Attorney General			
4	State Bar No. 111898 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000			
5	San Francisco, CA 94102-7004			
6	Telephone: (415) 703-5539 Facsimile: (415) 703-5480			
7	Attorneys for Complainant			
8	BEFORE THE MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS			
9	STATE OF CALIFORNIA			
10	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 800-2015-014341		
11	GEORGE WILLIAM PARKINSON, M.D	ACCUSATION		
12	1426 East Hamilton Ave. Campbell, CA 95008			
13	Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. G22439,			
14	Respondent.			
15				
16	Complainant alleges:			
17	PARTIES			
18	1. Kimberly Kirchmeyer (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in her official			
19	capacity as the Executive Director of the Medical Board of California.			
20		al Board issued Physician's and Surgeon's		
21	Certificate Number G22439 to George William Parkinson, M.D (Respondent). The Physician's			
22	and Surgeon's Certificate expired on July 31, 2017, and has not been renewed.			
23	JURISDICTION			
24	3. This Accusation is brought before the Medical Board of California (Board), under the			
25	authority of the following laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code			
26	unless otherwise indicated.			
27				
28				
	(GEORGE WILLIAM PARKINSON, M.D.) ACCUSATION NO. 800-2015-014341			
,	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			

- 4. Section 2227 of the Code provides that a licensee who is found guilty under the Medical Practice Act may have his or her license revoked, suspended for a period not to exceed one year, placed on probation and required to pay the costs of probation monitoring, or such other action taken in relation to discipline as the Board deems proper.
 - 5. Section 2234 of the Code, states:

"The board shall take action against any licensee who is charged with unprofessional conduct. In addition to other provisions of this article, unprofessional conduct includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- "(a) Violating or attempting to violate, directly or indirectly, assisting in or abetting the violation of, or conspiring to violate any provision of this chapter.
 - "(b) Gross negligence.
- "(c) Repeated negligent acts. To be repeated, there must be two or more negligent acts or omissions. An initial negligent act or omission followed by a separate and distinct departure from the applicable standard of care shall constitute repeated negligent acts.
- "(1) An initial negligent diagnosis followed by an act or omission medically appropriate for that negligent diagnosis of the patient shall constitute a single negligent act.
- "(2) When the standard of care requires a change in the diagnosis, act, or omission that constitutes the negligent act described in paragraph (1), including, but not limited to, a reevaluation of the diagnosis or a change in treatment, and the licensee's conduct departs from the applicable standard of care, each departure constitutes a separate and distinct breach of the standard of care."
 - 6. Section 725 of the Code states:
- "(a) Repeated acts of clearly excessive prescribing, furnishing, dispensing, or administering of drugs or treatment, repeated acts of clearly excessive use of diagnostic procedures, or repeated acts of clearly excessive use of diagnostic or treatment facilities as determined by the standard of the community of licensees is unprofessional conduct for a physician and surgeon, dentist, podiatrist, psychologist, physical therapist, chiropractor, optometrist, speech-language pathologist, or audiologist.

- "(b) Any person who engages in repeated acts of clearly excessive prescribing or administering of drugs or treatment is guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than one hundred dollars (\$100) nor more than six hundred dollars (\$600), or by imprisonment for a term of not less than 60 days nor more than 180 days, or by both that fine and imprisonment.
- "(c) A practitioner who has a medical basis for prescribing, furnishing, dispensing, or administering dangerous drugs or prescription controlled substances shall not be subject to disciplinary action or prosecution under this section.
- "(d) No physician and surgeon shall be subject to disciplinary action pursuant to this section for treating intractable pain in compliance with Section 2241.5."
- 7. Section 2266 of the Code states: The failure of a physician and surgeon to maintain adequate and accurate records relating to the provision of services to their patients constitutes unprofessional conduct.

FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Gross Negligence, Excessive Prescribing, Repeated Negligent Acts)
(Patient D.S.)

- 8. Respondent George William Parkinson, M.D., is subject to disciplinary action under sections 2234 and/or 2234(b) and/or 2234(c) and/or 725 in that Respondent excessively prescribed opioid medications to Patient D.S.¹ The circumstances are as follows:
- 9. On or about August 1, 2012, Patient D.S., a 44 year old male, came under respondent's care and treatment of an acute trauma after he was struck in the chest by a rock. The patient complained of pleuritic pain. The patient's history is limited to a note stating that the patient operated a backhoe and crane and was engaged in physically demanding work. A nonspecific reference to intermittent discogenic pain is merely stated, but not described. Respondent did not document a physical examination other than to draw a vertical line through 29 items on a review of systems checklist. Respondent did not list a specific diagnosis, but the patient appears to have had subjective complaints of chest pain, an insomnia. No treatment plan

¹ Patient names are abbreviated to protect privacy rights.

is documented and it cannot be discerned from the note what medical treatment or advice the patient was given.

- 10. On August 24, 2012, the patient returned with a complaint of rib pain, apparently from the same chest trauma. Respondent's notes are brief and lack significant details, stating only that the patient had pain in his left ribs. The patient's vital signs were taken, with a blood pressure measure at 193/114 and 193/103, but the only comment record is "hypertension" without any stated treatment plan. As before there is no documented physical examination, diagnosis or treatment plan. Although it is not documented in the chart note for the visit, reference to a CURES² report shows that Respondent started the patient on oxycodone³, 30 mg, #49.
- 11. Respondent continued to see the patient for a variety of musculoskeletal complaints through May 2015. In the first several months of treatment, serial x-rays were ordered; however, on January 17, 2013, Patient D.S.' insurer questioned the medical indication for multiple imaging studies given the fact that Respondent's records contained no abnormal findings.
- 12. Respondent's notes are uniformly sparse, omitting pertinent history of the presenting complaint, physical examination, diagnosis or treatment plan, such that it is difficult to determine what the patient's condition was at any point in time or whether he was benefitting from the medications prescribed.
- 13. Despite the lack of documented justification for opioid therapy, Respondent prescribed short and long acting opioids, primarily oxycodone, to Patient D.S. in escalating dosages without any documented rationale. By 2014-2015, Patient D.S. was receiving approximately 480 tablets or more of oxycodone, 30 mg., an excessive and potentially lethal dosage of morphine equivalent medication.
- 14. Respondent disregarded evidence that Patient D.S. was abusing his medications. On February 1, 2013, Patient D.S.' mother advised Respondent that Patient D.S. had an addictive

² CURES (Controlled Substance Utilization Review and Evaluation System) is a database of Schedule II, III and IV controlled substance prescriptions dispensed in California, serving the public health, regulatory oversight agencies and law enforcement.

³ Oxycodone hydrochloride is a controlled substance and a potent narcotic analgesic with multiple actions similar to those of morphine. It can produce drug dependence and has the potential for abuse.

personality and had a history of substance abuse dating back to age 12. She urged Respondent to substitute Suboxone⁴ for opioids. Respondent documented a discussion with the patient, who stated that the information was false, and based on that Respondent continued to prescribe opioids to Patient D.S. Respondent did not have D.S. sign a medication contract, did not consult CURES to determine whether the patient was obtaining early refills or getting opioids prescribed by other physicians and did not utilize urine toxicology screens to determine whether narcotics were being diverted. Two chain pharmacies notified Respondent that they would not continue to fill his prescriptions without a documented diagnosis to support them.

- 15. Patient D.S.' last documented visit with Respondent was on May 25, 2015, at which time Respondent reported that the patient's back pain persisted despite years of high dose opioid therapy. The patient's medications were on a taper that Respondent began in or about April 2015, without an explanation for the change in treatment plan. As on other visits the note is sparse, lacking a physical examination, treatment plan, diagnosis or rationale for continuing even a tapered therapy which had clearly failed.
- 16. Respondent is guilty of unprofessional conduct and Respondent's certificate is subject to disciplinary action based on his gross negligence, repeated negligent acts and/or excessive prescribing as set forth above and including, but not limited to, the following:
- A. Respondent inappropriately and excessively prescribed opioid medications to Patient D.S.;
- B. Respondent failed to perform and/or failed to document the basic elements of patient care, including but not limited to: a complete history, physical examination with findings, diagnosis, treatment plan with objectives, informed consent and discussion of alternative treatments;
- C. Respondent failed to utilize safeguards to assure that the patient was not abusing or diverting his narcotic medications, including but not limited to: utilizing a narcotic medication contract, checking CURES reports to ascertain whether the patient was obtaining early refills or

⁴ Suboxone is a trade name for a combination of an opioid, buprenorphine, and an opioid blocker, naloxone, used to treat patients who are dependent (addicted to) opioids.

doctor shopping and/or implementing urine toxicology screens to determine if the patient's escalating narcotic use might indicate drug diversion.

SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Gross Negligence, Excessive Prescribing, Repeated Negligent Acts) (Patient J.P.)

- 17. Respondent George William Parkinson, M.D., is subject to disciplinary action under sections 2234 and/or 2234(b) and/or 2234(c) and/or 725 in that Respondent excessively prescribed opioid medications to Patient J.P. The circumstances are as follows:
- 18. On April 16, 2013, Patient J.P., a 31 year old obese female, came under Respondent's care for chronic right knee pain which she attributed to a previous motor vehicle accident. She also gave a history of back pain and arthritis. The physical examination, which is documented by a vertical line drawn through multiple systems, was normal except for the patient's obesity (BMI = 40.7), high blood pressure (131/103) and tachycardia (measured at 95 and 103). Respondent requested that the patient provide prior medical records, but she apparently did not comply. Respondent prescribed oxycodone/APAP, 10/325 mg., #90, albeit his records do not document a consideration of alternative treatments or an informed consent discussion of the risks of opioid therapy. The patient obtained multiple additional prescriptions, each prescription issued within a week or less of the others, for this controlled substance prior to her next face-to-face visit.
- 19. Patient J.P. returned on May 16, 2013, at which time her complaints were back and knee pain. A physical examination is not documented. The patient was issued a prescription for oxycodone/APAP, 10/325 mg, #180. Per a CURES report⁵, the patient received prescriptions for additional narcotic medication on May 20, 22 and 24, 2013. On May 22, 2013 the patient

reported that the purse which contained her medication was stolen. Respondent's chart also states that "pharmacy search shows use of multiple pharmacies." Despite this evidence of possible drug seeking behavior and/or drug diversion on the part of Patient J.P., Respondent

⁵ The Board obtained CURES reports in the course of its investigation. Although respondent, as a licensed physician, had access to the CURES system, he did not utilize it to detect drug abuse/diversion by his patients.

continued prescribing high dose opioid medications for her, without requiring that the patient enter into a medication agreement or submit to a urine toxicology screen.⁶

- 20. In June 2013, Respondent added diazepam⁷, 10 mg, and hydrocodone/APAP⁸, 10/325 mg, to the patient's drug regimen. On August 8, 2013, Patient J.P. slipped and fell in a sandwich shop and Respondent agreed to provide a second opinion and undertake her care on a lien basis. In the following months, Patient J.P.'s use of opioids and benzodiazepines accelerated, such that in October 2013, she received diazepam, 10 mg., 320 tablets, oxycodone, 30 mg., 290 tablets, and hydrocodone, 10/325 mg., 1,000 tablets, via 14 prescriptions issued by Respondent. Apparently to evade detection of her abuse/diversion at the pharmacy, Patient J.P. filled her prescriptions at multiple pharmacies. Had Respondent utilized the CURES system, he would have been aware that Patient J.P. was abusing and/or diverting her medications.
- 21. On October 14, 2013, Patient J.P. was seen by a physician assistant at Kaiser Permanente. Patient J.P. was diagnosed with left patellofemoral syndrome and heat, non-narcotic anti-inflammatory medications, ice, stretching and strengthening were recommended. In a note, the physician assistant documented the patient's explanation for her past abuse of oxycodone: "States she was getting it for her husband not herself." The record of this visit was included in Respondent's chart but her admission of diverting narcotics was not commented on by him.
- 22. Information available on the CURES reporting system shows that Respondent continued to prescribe large quantities of controlled substances to Patient J.P., such that in April 2014 she received diazepam, 10 mg., 430 tablets, oxycodone, 30 mg., 230 tablets and hydrocodone, 10/325 mg., 550 tablets. In the same time period, Patient J.P. visited five other healthcare providers and obtained additional amounts of these three drugs from them. As had been her pattern from the outset of her treatment with Respondent, she utilized multiple pharmacies to evade detection.

⁶ Respondent's chart contains an undated lab order for a "comprehensive toxicology screen" but this test was either not performed or the results were not recorded.

⁷ Diazepam is a benzodiazepine and a controlled substance with a potential for habituation and abuse.

⁸ Hydrocodone (Vicodin) is an opioid and a controlled substance with a potential for habituation and abuse.

- 23. On January 12, 2015, Respondent received a printout of a CURES report from a pharmacy which showed that Patient J.P. was utilizing multiple providers and multiple pharmacies to obtain opioids and benzodiazepines. Thereafter, Respondent did begin a taper of Patient J.P.'s medications and he charted that "she is detoxing slowly from oxycodone." For the first time, he had Patient J.P. sign an agreement to receive her medications only from Respondent.
- Respondent is guilty of unprofessional conduct and Respondent's certificate is subject to disciplinary action based on his gross negligence, repeated negligent acts and/or excessive prescribing as set forth above and including, but not limited to, the following:
- A. Respondent inappropriately and excessively prescribed opioid medications to Patient J.P.;
- В. Respondent failed to utilize safeguards to assure that the patient was not abusing or diverting her narcotic medications, including but not limited to: utilizing a narcotic medication contract, checking CURES reports to ascertain whether the patient was obtaining early refills or doctor shopping and/or implementing urine toxicology screens to determine if the patient's escalating narcotic use might represent diversion.

THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Failure to Maintain Adequate and Accurate Records)

(All Patients)

- Respondent George William Parkinson, M.D., is subject to disciplinary action under 25. section 2234 and 2266 of the Code in that Respondent failed to maintain adequate and accurate records for his patients.
- Complainant incorporates the allegations of the First and Second Causes for 26. Discipline as though fully set out in this, the Third, Cause for Discipline.

///

///

28